

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XXIII, Issue No. 5

November 2017

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

The NRA is smaller than you'd think – so why does it wield such influence?

NRA-break the cycle

By Dominic Rushe in New York

Why is the National Rifle Association so powerful? Here's a clue: it's not (just) about the money.

The vast majority of Americans support gun control, and yet Congress has failed to toughen laws even in the wake of a series of mass shootings. It is an easy argument to make that the gun lobby has bought Washington – but that fails to paint a full picture.

So far this year, the NRA has spent \$4.1m on lobbying. For comparison, the US Chamber of Commerce, the largest spender of all, has spent \$104m.

The NRA's influence does not stem solely from lobbying, thanks to the supreme court's Citizens United decision, which allows groups and individuals to back – or attack – candidates, as long as those campaigns are not made in cooperation with, or at the request of, a candidate.

The NRA's cash seems to have been well spent. In 2016 the NRA poured \$14.4m into supporting 44 candidates who won and \$34.4m opposing 19 candidates who lost, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. Its only big loss was in Nevada, for the seat vacated by the Democratic minority leader, Harry Reid.

Nor does the power of the guns manufacturers fully explain the NRA's power. Gun and ammunition manufacturers will have revenues of \$13.3bn and profits of \$1bn in 2017, according to IBISWorld. Gun and ammunition stores this year will have

revenues of \$85.bn and profits of \$256m.

But there are far bigger industries. The auto industry (which has spent \$51.8m on lobbying so far in 2017), is on course for revenues of \$105.3bn and profits of \$3.1bn in 2017.

Dan Auble, a senior researcher at CRP, said NRA's spending was at a record high but remained "paltry" in comparison to groups like the pharmaceutical industry.

"The real source of [the NRA's] power, I believe, comes from voters," said Adam Winkler, professor of constitutional law at the UCLA School of Law and author of *Gunfight: The Battle over the Right to Bear Arms in America*.

By choosing its battles wisely, the NRA has shown an ability to swing primary elections in favor of pro-gun candidates, Winkler said. "That's the real source of their strength," he said.

The 145-year-old organization claims 5 million active members, although that number is disputed. But whatever its actual size, that membership is a powerful tool, said Robert Spitzer, professor of crime, law and policy and gun control at the State University of New York at Cortland and the author of five books on guns.

There are, however, problems on the horizon for the NRA. For one, the gun control lobby is growing. Billionaire Michael Bloomberg's gun control group Everytown for Gun Safety is threatening to spend more than \$25m in 2018 races. Americans for Responsible Solutions, a gun control political action committee set up by Gabrielle Giffords, a former Democratic congresswoman whose career was ended when she was shot along with

18 others in an Arizona suburb, spent \$13.4m in 2016.

But the NRA faces existential issues in the years ahead as its opposition grows.

By mid-century the US is expected to become a majority minority nation. The NRA's core constituency is basically older white males. Younger people are not taking up gun ownership at the same rate as older people did, said Spitzer, and polls of minorities show they feel more strongly about gun control. Attempts by the NRA to broaden its appeal do not seem to have paid off. "They are facing an existential demographic problem," said Spitzer.

Even a Trump presidency may not be good for the NRA. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton presented the NRA with obvious foes. Gun sales are falling after the glory years of the Obama administration, when each mass shooting led to a spike in sales as Democrats called for gun control and gun owners ran to the shops. The industry – and the NRA – lack a demon to drive sales and membership.

The NRA has shifted gears post-Obama, taking a leaf out of Trump's all-caps textbook and attacking the media for demonizing gun owners and the president. Such a move is unlikely to win over minority support.

"If the NRA really wants to reach a new generation, maybe they need to reach out to Black Lives Matter. Who are the people who are being abused by government agents the most? You would think that Black Lives Matter would have some affinity with that idea that you need guns to protect yourself against a hostile government that can't protect you," said Spitzer.

But even the NRA knows that the best thing that the gun control movement could see right now would be a lot of African Americans or Muslims carrying guns around America.

The NRA has changed many times in its history, for much of the 20th century it supported gun control. For all its current power there is nothing to suggest the organization is invulnerable to change. Indeed, in this month's special elections NRA favorites fell to candidates who support more gun control. "The NRA face really significant challenges. How they manage them remains to be seen," said Spitzer.

-- www.theguardian.com 17 Nov 2017

Nevada rancher Cliven Bundy goes on trial for leading 2014 armed standoff

By John L. Smith

LAS VEGAS (Reuters) - Nevada rancher Cliven Bundy went on trial on Monday for his role in leading a 2014 armed standoff against federal agents that became a rallying point for militia groups challenging U.S. government authority in the American West.

Bundy and three others are accused of conspiracy, assault, firearms offenses and other charges stemming from the confrontation near Bunkerville, Nevada.

The revolt was sparked by the court-ordered roundup of Bundy's cattle by government agents over his refusal to pay fees required to graze the herd on federal land.

Hundreds of supporters, many heavily armed, rallied to Bundy's cause demanding that his livestock be returned. Outnumbered law enforcement officers ultimately retreated rather than risk bloodshed. No shots were ever fired.

The face-off marked a flashpoint in long-simmering tensions over federal control of public lands in the West and a precursor to Bundy's two sons leading an armed six-week occupation of a federal wildlife center in Oregon in 2016.

Defense lawyers have generally argued that the Bunkerville defendants were exercising constitutionally protected rights to assembly and to bear arms, casting the showdown as a patriotic act of civil disobedience against government overreach.

Prosecutors have argued that armed gunmen were using force and intimidation to defy the rule of law.

Standing trial with Cliven Bundy, 71, are his sons, Ammon and Ryan Bundy, and a fourth defendant,

Ryan Payne, a Montana resident linked by prosecutors to a militia group called Operation Mutual Aid.

All four men chose to appear for Monday's proceedings in red jail garb instead of civilian clothes, in what a defense lawyer said was a show of unity. The courtroom was packed with about 75 Bundy family supporters.

Judge Gloria Navarro said she expected the trial to run through late February.

A would-be fifth trial defendant, internet blogger and radio host Peter Santilli, pleaded guilty on Oct. 6 to conspiracy and faces a possible six-year prison term.

Six lesser-known participants in the Nevada ranch showdown went on trial as a group earlier this year. Two men were found guilty, one of them sentenced to 68 years in prison. The other is awaiting sentencing.

Two of the four remaining defendants from that group were acquitted, and two others pleaded guilty last week to obstructing a court order. Those two each faces up to a year in prison.

Yet another group of six defendants, including two more Bundy sons, Dave and Mel Bundy, are due to stand trial 30 days after the current trial ends.

Ammon and Ryan Bundy, along with five other people, were previously charged with criminal conspiracy in the takeover of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in Oregon. That trial ended with the surprise acquittal last year of all seven.

-- Reuters October 30, 2017

First Look: Federal's New 224 Valkyrie

By David Macar

Federal Premium Ammunition has made a big announcement this week about its new cartridge, the .224 Valkyrie.

The company is calling it the best AR-platform cartridge ever developed, able to maintain supersonic speeds past the 1,300-yard mark with a 90-grain Gold Medal Sierra MatchKing bullet.

While the round was designed for ARs, it offers superb long-range performance in bolt-action rifles, the company says.

"Federal Premium has drawn from its 95 years of ammunition manufacturing excellence to develop an all-new cartridge that transforms the MSR 15 platform, unleashes shooters' long-range potential and shatters the boundaries of ballistic performance,"

the company said in a statement. "The 224 Valkyrie provides extremely flat trajectories and match accuracy beyond 1,300 yards. The cartridge offers significantly less wind drift and drop than other loads in its class, as well as less than half the recoil of cartridges with comparable ballistics. Loaded in an unmatched array of high-performance projectiles, 224 Valkyrie is the new choice for both long-range target shooters and hunters."

The Valkyrie will be available with four bullet options: 100-grain Fusion MSR (\$28.95), 60-grain Nosler Ballistic Tip Varmint (\$29.95), 75-grain American Eagle TMJ (\$13.95), and the 90-grain Gold Medal Sierra MatchKing (\$31.95). -- www.range365.com Oct. 26, 2017

Professor: Homicide Rates Not Affected by Gun Control on Private Sales

By AWR Hawkins

LaGrange College professor John A. Tures cross-examined various figures on gun crime and found that homicide rates are not markedly different for states with gun control for private sales versus states without. He did this as a project with his students, wherein they examined a study that provided an overview of findings from a wide spectrum of angles and political persuasions, including findings that are considered nonpartisan. These findings included figures from The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, the NRA-ILA, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

According to the *Ledger Enquirer*, Tures was initially persuaded that "the average gun-related homicide rate per 100,000 people among gun control states (3.31) was lower than those with no regulation of private gun sales (4.28)." Then he realized that an error exists in the way figures from certain states are tallied.

For example, "Two gun control states, and nine gun rights states, had too few gun homicides to calculate a rate, and were left out of the study." So Tores and his students created an extra table for the study, adding in the figures that had been left out of the original. The result was "that there was little to no difference in the results" between gun control states and states with more relaxed gun laws.

Tores wrote: "We cannot conclude that states that regulate private gun sales have a higher, or lower, gun homicide rate."

This finding is pertinent because gun control proponents

respond to nearly every mass public attack by pushing for an expansion of background checks. Such an expansion is tantamount to regulating private gun sales. Sen. Chris Murphy (D-CT) is pushing such regulation now, as a response to the October 1 Vegas attack, although the Vegas attacker passed background checks for his firearms.

-- www.breitbart.com October 26, 2017

AWR Hawkins is the Second Amendment columnist for Breitbart News and the political analyst for Armed American Radio.

San Francisco 49ers Pledge \$500,000 to Push Suppressor Ban, Other Measures

By AWR Hawkins

The San Francisco 49ers pledged \$500,000 Thursday to secure a suppressor ban and other gun controls.

The push comes in the weeks after the Las Vegas attack. Suppressors were not used in that attack, but the 49ers are dedicated to banning the devices anyway.

According to ESPN, the 49ers presented the gun control pledge as part of creating a "more understanding and safer America." The \$500,000 will also be used to push a ban on bump stocks and armor-piercing bullets.

-- www.breitbart.com October 26, 2017

Ed.: Football anyone?

The Left has gun-toting militias of its own, Charlottesville lawsuit reveals

With a name like Redneck Revolt, one "paramilitary" group named in a lawsuit filed in the wake of the deadly Charlottesville protests sounds like the classic alt-right, gun-toting militia many blame for the August incident that sparked a national debate on race and guns.

But Redneck Revolt is a sometimes-armed militia that left-wing protesters have apparently started calling on for security, and critics say it represents a growing group of heat-packing, far-left social justice warriors who are "willing to take on personal risk to defend those in our community," according to the group's website.

The lawsuit, brought by The Georgetown Law Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection (ICAP), could shine a light on groups like Redneck Revolt by lumping them in with not only admitted fascist groups like Vanguard America, but also the conservative militias whose leaders say

they came to safeguard participants in the Aug. 11 Unite the Right rally that exploded into violence.

"If you get into an arms race with a bunch of scared people who have little or no experience of gun violence—I'm talking about antifascists as well as the alt fascists, we're scared too—you're creating an extremely volatile situation," a counter-protester told the website CrimethInc. "All it takes is one jumpy person pulling a trigger."

Members of the sometimes-armed left-wing group Redneck Revolt say they are prepared to protect the free speech rights of protesters.

The more prominent defendants targeted in the suit include Unite the Right organizer Jason Kessler and a handful of fascist groups that attended. But ICAP is also taking aim at left-leaning paramilitary organizations, militias that claim their members were only on scene to keep the peace.

"Private armies" caused "irreparable and incalculable injuries" to the city as well as various local businesses and neighborhood groups, the lawsuit claims. The suit suggests these "unauthorized" militias undercut the local government's "authority to protect public safety," and aims to "prevent defendants from returning to Virginia organized as military units and engaging in paramilitary activity."

Redneck Revolt and other armed militias that were present say they were keeping the peace — regardless of who they were defending. Christian Yingling, a defendant and commanding officer of an organization called Pennsylvania Light Foot Militia, argued on Facebook that police "told us it was perfectly fine for us to be there, and perfectly legal for us to be armed." The Charlottesville Police Department did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

No one seems to be disputing that members of groups like The Light Foot militias, the Virginia Minutemen and Redneck Revolt were legally carrying firearms. The dispute is whether they made things safer, or more dangerous.

Members of Redneck Revolt have said they were sought by counter-demonstrators to provide safety. Yet, the group's relationship to the left-wing protesters appears to be absent from ICAP's suit.

While there is no evidence of any Redneck Revolt members being involved in violence, the lawsuit's suggestion that the left was without a private army of its own — especially

since Redneck Revolt is named as a defendant — seems a glaring omission.

Redneck Revolt's website boasts more than 40 chapters nationwide.

Like some of their conservative counterparts, Redneck Revolt has apparently captured the attention of the FBI. According to one law enforcement source, warnings have been distributed to agencies across the country regarding their group and others.

A self-described Redneck Revolt member told the "Feminist Killjoys, PhD" podcast that while there may be historical parallels with organizations like the Black Panthers, the presence of "armed leftists on the streets of an American city [preserving and protecting] human life... was kind of a historical shift."

In a podcast on Redneck Revolt's website, another alleged member said, "Folks realized that there needed to be armed security because the fascists were absolutely coming in swinging," adding that members were showered with gratitude by the protesters they came to defend.

Left-wing groups carrying legal guns at demonstrations [is] seeing some support in academia.

"I don't think it's ludicrous that if white supremacists are carrying guns that anti-fascists might want to carry guns, too," Mark Bray, a visiting Dartmouth professor and author of "ANTIFA: The Anti-Fascist Handbook," told a New York gathering in September.

ICAP's lawsuit doesn't attempt to separate militia groups by their alliances, saying all of the armed groups "terrified local residents and caused attendees to mistake them for authorized military personnel."

Richard Cohen, president of the Southern Poverty Law Center, a group often derided for harboring a bias for left-wing groups, reportedly also disagrees with the tactics of armed militias.

"We just don't need volunteers with guns coming to public rallies," Cohen said in an interview. "It's a recipe for disaster." --

www.foxnews.com/us/2017/10/20/

Scientists look for a cure against politically undesirable behaviour

The 'Free World' has taken on where the Soviet scientists and psychiatrists left off. German scientists of renowned Universities in Bonn and Lübeck do research on treatment for

politically undesirable behaviour like their Soviet colleagues from the infamous Serbsky Central Research Institute in Moscow. In the Soviet Union people who protested the system had to undergo psychiatric treatment.

That will be the fate of the so called Free World's citizens if they fail to conform to the idea of a multi-cultural society. Scientists are already busy working on bettering our collective and individual psyche. Apart from homophobia and Islamophobia, xenophobia - the name for in-group loyalty and out-group avoidance - is another psychiatric condition that needs to undergo therapy.

Xenophobia is a biological mechanism imprinted at the genetic level that carries a survival advantage. It tells an individual to create bonds with members of the same group and be on his guard against aliens. Xenophobia is practised each time parents warn their offspring to be wary of strangers: not to open the door to them, not to trust them. So modern social engineers have a problem. They need to overcome this deeply rooted biological barrier.

The mentioned scientists, who otherwise dutifully recognize the evolutionary advantage of the in-group loyalty/out-group exclusion, nevertheless set themselves a task of demonstrating whether **oxytocin** - this hormone that raises the emotional well-being - can enforce the acceptance of aliens and reduce xenophobic out-group rejection. To this end they devised experiments in which subjects were asked to donate a certain amount of money to people in need, either compatriots or refugees. Before the experiment the subjects were screened for the level of xenophobia. During the experiment the subjects were either allowed to act on their own, or were exposed to peer pressure, or were administered oxytocin intra-nasally. It turned out that refugee-directed donation among the subjects scoring low on xenophobia were significantly increased by oxytocin, whereas oxytocin alone was not enough in the case of the subjects scoring high on xenophobia: their out-group avoidance (or parochial, as it is patronizingly named, altruism) could only be overcome by oxytocin and peer pressure....

The conclusions are obvious. Citizens of host countries must be forced to accept the influx of aliens whether they like it or not. If they do not comply then, in the name of high-flown ideals of universal brotherhood of men, they will be forced either by peer

pressure or by oxytocin or by both. Oxytocin suits this purpose very well as this hormone is so to say oh-so humane. Like Aldous Huxley's soma in his book *Brave New World*. The human being with his biologically-driven likes and dislikes is not to be tolerated. He must be made to like what he previously disliked. There was systematic political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union, based on the interpretation of political opposition or dissent as a psychiatric problem. The 'Free World' has taken on where the Soviet 'scientists' left off.

-- Global Analysis from the European Perspective gefira.org/2017/11/03

Political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union

There was systematic political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union, based on the interpretation of political opposition or dissent as a psychiatric problem. It was called "psychopathological mechanisms" of dissent.

During the leadership of General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, psychiatry was used to disable and remove from society political opponents ("dissidents") who openly expressed beliefs that contradicted the official dogma. The term "philosophical intoxication", for instance, was widely applied to the mental disorders diagnosed when people disagreed with the country's Communist leaders and, by referring to the writings of the Founding Fathers of Marxism—Leninism—Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Vladimir Lenin—made them the target of criticism.

The "anti-Soviet" political behavior of some individuals — being outspoken in their opposition to the authorities, demonstrating for reform, and writing critical books — were defined simultaneously as criminal acts (e.g., a violation of Articles 70 or 190-1), symptoms of mental illness (e.g., "delusion of reformism"), and susceptible to a ready-made diagnosis (e.g., "sluggish schizophrenia"). Within the boundaries of the diagnostic category, the symptoms of pessimism, poor social adaptation and conflict with authorities were themselves sufficient for a formal diagnosis of "sluggish schizophrenia." —Wikipedia.org

The Incredible Legacy of Antony Sutton

By John Rappaport

The prodigious author and researcher, Antony Sutton (1925-

2002), wrote about hidden men behind momentous events.

I recently came across a 1999 interview with Sutton, conducted by Kris Millegan, researcher and head of TrineDay publishers.

Millegan wrote: "Antony C. Sutton, 74, has been persecuted but never prosecuted for his research and subsequent publishing of his findings. In 1968, his *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, published by The Hoover Institute at Stanford University, showed how the Soviet state's technological and manufacturing base, which was then engaged in supplying the North Vietnamese the armaments and supplies to kill and wound American soldiers, was built by US firms and mostly paid for by the US taxpayers. From their largest steel and iron plant, to automobile manufacturing equipment, to precision ball-bearings and computers, basically the majority of the Soviet's large industrial enterprises had been built with the U.S. help or technical assistance."

"...Then, someone sent Antony a membership list of Skull and Bones and— 'a picture jumped out'. And what a picture! A multigenerational foreign-based secret society with fingers in all kinds of pies and roots going back to 'Illuminati' influences in 1830's Germany."

Here are excerpts from the 1999 interview:

Sutton — I knew nothing of S&B until I received a letter in the early 80's asking if I would like to look at a genuine membership list. For no real reason I said yes. It was agreed to send the package by Federal Express and I could keep it for 24 hours, it had to be returned to the safe. It was a "black bag" job by a family member disgusted with their activities.

How did I feel? I felt then (as I do now) that these "prominent" men are really immature juveniles at heart. The horrible reality is that these little boys have been dominant in their influence in world affairs. No wonder we have wars and violence. Skull and Bones is the symbol of terrorist violence, pirates, the SS Deaths Head Division in WW Two, labels on poison bottles and so on.

By conventional standards I am an abject failure. I've been thrown out of two major Universities (UCLA and Stanford), denied tenure at Cal State Los Angeles. Every time I write something, it appears to offend someone in the Establishment and they throw me to the wolves.

On the other hand I've written 26 books, published a couple of newsletters and so on...even more important I've never compromised on the truth. And I don't quit.

In material terms...hopeless failure. In terms of discovery...I think I've been successful. Judge a man by his enemies. William Buckley called me a "jerk". Glenn Campbell, former Director of the Hoover Institution, Stanford called me "a problem".

Couple of years back, a Dutch TV production company from Amsterdam—under contract to Dutch National TV—came to US to make documentary on S&B [Skull and Bones].

I saw extracts from the original and it is a good professional job. They had documents linking Bush family and other S&B members to financing Hitler through Union Banking of New York and its Dutch correspondent bank. [See Sutton's book *Wall Street And The Rise Of Hitler*]

(This Dutch TV production is on YouTube in two parts: *Skull and Bones Part 1 and Part 2*)

Millegan – What do you see for the future?

Sutton – Chaos, confusion and ultimately a battle between the individual and the State.

The individual is the stronger; and will win. The state is a fiction sanctified by Hegel and his followers to CONTROL the individual.

Sooner or later people will wake up. First we have to dump the trap of right and left, this is a Hegelian trap to divide and control. The battle is not between right and left; it is between us and them...

-- www.technocracy.news Sep. 1, 2017

Why Muslims will never assimilate in America

By Bill Federer

Bill Federer gives detailed analysis of Muslim assimilation with American law

The United Nations adopted "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights," Dec. 10, 1948, recognizing such basic human rights as:

- Freedom of opinion and expression
- Freedom to change religions
- Right to education
- No slavery
- No forced marriages
- No torture
- No inhumane punishment

The leaders of 57 Islamic countries rejected the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights, forming

their own group called the OIC – Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

The OIC passed in 1990 the "Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam" affirming Shariah law as supreme, with:

- the death penalty for those leaving Islam
- punishing women who are victims of rape
- allowing men to be polygamous
- permitting wife beating
- censoring speech insulting Islam

Should a nation grant freedom of speech to those whose ultimate goal is to abolish freedom of speech? Should a nation grant freedom of religion to those whose ultimate goal is to abolish freedom of religion? Do Sharia-practicing Muslims want to demand freedoms for themselves, but not grant the same freedoms to others?

Dwight Eisenhower faced a similar situation, warning in Time magazine, Oct. 13, 1952: "The Bill of Rights contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to destroy the Bill of Rights. A group ... dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties, cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the government."

Are the Quran and the U.S. Constitution compatible

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the "free exercise" of religion, yet Mohammad said "Whoever changes his Islamic religion, kill him." (Hadith Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 9, Book 84, No. 57). The Quran also states in Sura 4:89 "Those who reject Islam must be killed. If they turn back (from Islam), take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them."

The First Amendment states Congress shall not abridge "the freedom of speech," yet Islamic law enforces dhimmi status on non-Muslims, prohibiting them from observing their religious practices publicly, raising their voices during prayer, ringing church bells or say anything considered "insulting to Islam." Islamic law relegates non-Muslims to "dhimmi" status, where they are not to propagate their customs among Muslims and cannot display a cross, Christmas decorations, or the Star of David.

The First Amendment states Congress cannot take away "the right of the people to peaceably assemble,"

yet Islamic law states non-Muslims cannot repair places of worship or build new ones, they must allow Muslims to participate in their private meetings, they cannot bring their dead near the graveyards of Muslims or mourn their dead loudly.

The First Amendment states Congress cannot take away the right of the people "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," yet Islamic law states non-Muslims are not to harbor any hostility towards the Islamic state or give comfort to those who disagree with Islamic government.

Brought to you by AmericanMinute.com.

-- <http://www.wnd.com/2017/11/21>

Ed.: Next month, Federer's comparison of our U.S. Constitution's Second through Twenty-first amendments with Islamic teaching.

CAIR leader refuses to denounce Hamas, Muslim Brotherhood

By Leo Hohmann

The Minnesota leader of the Council on American-Islamic Relations was asked during a community meeting Saturday if he would renounce the terrorist organization Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood.

He refused.

The event at the St. Cloud Public Library was part of CAIR's ongoing "anti-Islamophobia" campaign that it launched in the wake of the election of President Donald Trump.

About 30 people attended the event Saturday, and they were told Muslims are on the verge of being rounded up and placed in internment camps, just like the Japanese were in 1942 under an executive order signed by President Franklin Roosevelt.

Titled "Japanese-American Incarceration: Could it Happen Again?" the event began with a presentation by a professor of African-American studies at the University of Minnesota, followed by comments from Jaylani Hussein, executive director of CAIR Minnesota, and other panelists.

Professor Yuichiro Onishi said it was his belief that the U.S. was one "trigger" event away from Muslims being rounded up. He explained that America has a history of using immigration laws as a pretext for "state-sanctioned racism," citing the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the immigration acts of 1927 and 1924, which limited the number of Asians migrating to the U.S.

Jaylani Hussein then presented the Somali refugee

community in Minnesota as victims of the latest American racism, taking the form of anti-Muslim bigotry equal to that leveled against the Chinese and Japanese leading up to World War II.

Hussein said Americans only hear in the media about the bad things Somali Muslims do in Minnesota, from stealing and sexually assaulting women at the Mall of America just last week to stabbing people at the Mall of America and at the Crossroads Center Mall in St. Cloud last year. This is all fear-mongering, and it's a huge industry in the United States, Hussein said.

Then came the question-and-answer period.

Local resident Elizabeth Baklaich reminded the professor that America "already had that trigger moment."

"That trigger moment was 9/11. There were 3,000 people who died," she said. "... [T]hat was a direct attack that was followed up by war, and if we were going to make this same maneuver against Muslims, it would have happened. ... I just wanted to bring that up because I think that's a fundamental flaw in your thesis," Baklaich said.

To Hussein, she directed another question.

"I heard you talk about fear Jaylani, and there's one thing you could do very easily that would help alleviate a tremendous amount of fear in this community," Baklaich said.

She reminded him of the FBI evidence presented in the Holy Land Foundation terror-financing trial of 2007 that showed CAIR is a front group for Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood.

"If you want to be our friend, and you want to be part of the community, and want us to accept you more, and work with you and be less fearful of what's coming in, and what's going on, are you willing to condemn both Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood?" she asked.

Listen to [the audio tape of] Minnesota CAIR leader Jaylani Hussein's angry response to a simple question: Will you denounce Hamas

and the Muslim Brotherhood?

In a rambling response that quickly morphed into a stern lecture before ending with a hostile rebuke, Hussein refused to condemn either Hamas or the Brotherhood.

Hamas is listed by the U.S. State Department as a designated foreign terrorist organization, and the Muslim Brotherhood has been banned by at least eight countries as a terrorist organization, including Russia, Saudi Arabia, UAE and Egypt.

President Trump indicated before last year's election he would see to it that the U.S. joined the list of nations that ban the Brotherhood, but so far it hasn't happened.

-- <http://www.wnd.com/2017/11/20>

Trump's IRS Swamp

Donald Trump promised to drain the swamp, and here's a seven month progress report: The Washington bog is still as wide and fetid as ever. Consider that Mr. Trump's Justice Department has inexplicably continued to defend the IRS's misdeeds under President Obama.

To this day conservative nonprofits are being toyed with by the IRS.

The IRS is fighting Judicial Watch in a suit over document requests.

-- Judicial Watch's *In the Media* November 2017

Mattis, Tillerson Want Blank Check to Wage Illegal War

By Marjorie Cohn

The October 4 killings of four US soldiers in Niger brought the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearing on October 30 into sharper focus. It turns out the presence of these troops in Niger was unlawful.

Defense Secretary James Mattis claimed the soldiers were on a train-and-advise mission. He insisted that Title 10 of the US Code grants authority for train-and-advise missions anywhere in the world. But the War Powers Resolution (WPR), passed by Congress in the wake of the Vietnam

War, specifies that the president's authority to order US troops into hostilities cannot be inferred from any provision of law that does not specifically authorize the use of US forces in hostilities. And Title 10 does not.

The WPR allows the president to introduce US Armed Forces into hostilities or imminent hostilities in only three situations:

First, after Congress has declared war, which has not happened since World War II. Second, in "a national emergency created by attack upon the U.S., its territories or possessions, or its armed forces," which had not occurred prior to the killings of the US troops in Niger. And third, when there is "specific statutory authorization," such as an Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

In the 2001 AUMF, Congress authorized the president to use military force against individuals, groups and countries that had supported the 9/11 attacks. Congress rejected the G. W. Bush administration's request for open-ended military authority "to deter and preempt any future acts of terrorism or aggression against the United States." That AUMF does not authorize US military action in Niger against ISIS, which didn't even exist in 2001.

The WPR requires the president to report to Congress within 48 hours of introducing US forces into hostilities.

-- Truthout | News Analysis November 4, 2017

Letter to the Editor

Dear Reader,

There is a story here [in news clippings about the removal of Confederate monuments from public places] but where is the end. We are under attack and losing our history piece by piece. Where does it stop?

Should we just rip it all down? I think we must fight back! We may lose it all but if we don't fight back we will.

AA
Florida

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

Back issues, from 1997 to date, can be found online. Just go to: <https://archive.org/> and in the Search Field, type in "New Jersey Militia Newsletter". So grab the PDFs and pass them around via email to others who have never seen the hard copies.

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375
Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 375-4840

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____